IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

WALTER FERGUSON and)	
CHARLENE FERGUSON,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	1:11CV670
)	
OPTION ONE MORTGAGE)	
CORPORATION, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER AND RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This matter comes before the Court on motions filed by *pro se* Plaintiffs Walter Ferguson and Charlene Ferguson, including (1) a motion to produce discovery pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum (Docket No. 4); (2) a motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction (Docket No. 9); and a motion requesting that the Court deny the Defendants' request for an enlargement of time to respond to the complaint (Docket No. 12).

Plaintiffs' motion for discovery is **DENIED** since there has been no initial pretrial order as yet in this case and no order opening a period of discovery. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1). **IT IS RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiffs' motion for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction be denied. Plaintiffs are not entitled to a temporary restraining

order since they have not shown an immediate risk of irreparable harm before the adverse

party can be heard. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(A). With regard to the request for a

preliminary injunction, wherein Plaintiffs seek to overturn an order of foreclosure against 905

Spring Lane, Sanford, North Carolina, the request should be denied. Plaintiffs seeks directly

to have a state court ruling in a civil action overruled. Such a request appears outside the

jurisdiction of this court by reason of the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. See Exxon Mobil Corp

v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp., 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005). Accordingly, Plaintiffs cannot make

a requisite showing of likely success in support of their request for a preliminary injunction.

Plaintiffs' motion filed as Docket No. 12 is MOOT in view of the Court's Order of

September 27 (Docket No. 15).

/s/ P. Trevor Sharp United States Magistrate Judge

Date: January 18, 2012

-2-